REMARKS

The Examiner has required a Restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 to either claims 1–13 and 28–34, drawn to processing multimedia data using multimedia components; or to claims 14–19 and 35–40, drawn to a dynamically changing the assembly of the multimedia processor; or to claims 20 and 41–42, drawn to locating and querying multimedia components; or to claims 21–27 and 43–50, drawn to retrieving a part of multimedia stream using multimedia components.

Applicants elect claims 1–13 and 28–34 to be examined. Applicants are canceling claims 45 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14–27, 34–44, and 46–50 have been withdrawn as the result of the restriction requirement. As a result, claims 1–13 and 28–34 are pending for examination with claims 1, 8 and 28 being independent claims. In view of the Examiner's restriction requirement, Applicants reserve the right to present claims 14–27, 34–44, and 46–50 in one or more divisional applications.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–13 and 28–34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Richter et al (US 6,725,279) ("Richter"). Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection and points out that Richter does not teach, disclose, or suggest a, "topology describing a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams" as claimed by Applicant.

Independent claims 1 and 28 call for:

"...[a] <u>topology describing</u> a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams;" (underlining added for emphasis)

Independent claim 8 calls for:

"...<u>a topology describing</u> a set of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams;" (underlining added for emphasis)

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 28 are not anticipated by Richter under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The specification of the present invention provides:

"...the <u>topology describing a set</u> of input multimedia streams, one or more sources for the input multimedia streams, a sequence of operations to perform on the multimedia data, and a set of output multimedia streams." (pg. 3, para 6, lines 4–7; underlining added for emphasis)

"…The topology provides a path that the data streams take through the media and stream sources, the transforms, and the media and stream sinks. In block 308, the topology loader will pass this topology on to the media processor. The media processor sets up and implements the topology." (pg. 13–14, para 31, lines 8–12; underlining added for emphasis)

"The media processor is the object that performs the data flow as described by a topology." (pg. 14, para 32, lines 1–2; underlining added for emphasis)

As such, the claimed topology is a description including specific elements that is passed by a loader to a media processor that implements the topology. The topology is a virtual entity that describes what the media processor implements.

Richter, on the other hand provides:

"…to create a subset of multimedia processing blocks, the application interface selects multimedia processing blocks to form said set, and then examines the input and output interfaces of said multimedia processing blocks selected in order to check whether all the multimedia data exchanges required to perform the task are possible within said subset and determine, for these exchanges, the encoding format of the multimedia data to be exchanged and the communication buses to be used to connect the different multimedia processing blocks of said subset in pairs according to the complementarity of the ports of

their respective input and output interface." (Richter, col. 2, lines 37-49; underlining added for emphasis)

"For each multimedia task, <u>application interface IA creates a subset of the multimedia processing blocks required to run said task</u>. In order to create these subsets, the application interface must know the capacity of each of the multimedia processing blocks to be connected in send mode or receive mode to the various communication buses in the system. It is for this reason that when the subset is created, application interface IA selects a first subset of blocks and then examines the input and output interfaces of the selected blocks to check whether all of the exchanges relative to the task to be run are possible. For example, to determine whether or not a multimedia flow may be created between block B1 and block B2, the application interface examines the connecting ports of output interface IS1 of block 1 and those of the input interface of block B2. Data exchanges are possible provided that these two interfaces have ports enabling them to be connected to a common communication network. If both blocks can access several common communication buses, application interface IA chooses the most suitable network according to the nature of the multimedia data." (Richter, col. 3, lines 16-34; underlining added for emphasis)

As such, Richter does not teach, disclose, or suggest a virtual entity or description including specific elements that is implemented by a media processor or the like such as Applicant's claimed topology.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 28 are not anticipated by Richter under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 are each dependent on one of claims 1, 8, or 28. As such, claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon one of claims 1, 8, and 28.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: _____ June 7, 2007 _____   By: ____ /L. Alan Collins/ _____

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 7, 2007   _____ /Kate Marochkina/ _____
 Date   Signature

     _____ Kate Marochkina _____
     Printed Name